G. R. S. 59]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

190

(Salaries and Allowances)

File No. 231 of 1903-04

Serial Nos. 1–3

Papers Filed.

Month _____

SUBJECT.

Prayer of Kesavayya, late Revenue gumasta of the Bagepalli Taluk, for enhancement of pension.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.	LATER REFERENCES.
S&A 54 of 1902-03	

Gl & Rev. Secretariat

~~Office of the Dewan of Mysore.~~

File No. (if any)

Directions.

No., date and purport of receipts to be entered in red, and office note in black ink in order of dates.—To be written only on one side, and inside the line of margin.

Office Note.

Branch P & A.

Subject Enhancement of the pension granted to Kesavayya late Revenue gumasta of the Bagepalli Taluk.

—

Petition Regd No. 33 R d: 3/7/03 from Kesavayya.

Kesavayya entered Govt. Service on the 9th November 1867 and retired therefrom on the 17th Novr 1901. He was drawing a pay of less than Rs 10/- from the 9th November 1867 to the 28th December 1881 and a pay of Rs 10 and above from the 29th Decr 1881 to the 17th Novr 1901. The former period was treated as "Inferior Service" and the latter as "Superior Service" The Service on pay of Rs 10/- was not as is complained by the petitioner, treated as "Inferior" Deducting the periods not reckoned as service, the total ~~qual~~ qualifying service in the Inferior grades amounted to 14-1-20 y m d and in the superior grades to 19-8-14 y m d For this mixed service, he was entitled to a gratuity of Rs 42 and a pension of Rs 4-9-10 (after deduction under art 321(a)) under art. 258 of the M.S. Regulations. This was

Flag B

was sanctioned in G. O. No. 2431-22 P&A 193 × dt 16/8/02. Thus the petitioner has nothing to complain of. May the Petr be informed accordingly

Sub 2 Jones.

DM 25/7/03

DB 30/7/03

Were there any cases in which he gave a full pension accdg to Superior Service rules — such cases? Is the Petr's case like them?

30/7/03

Sub 2 Nil. Nothing more.

DM 3/8/03

DB 5/8/03

Draft Order submitted?

× The Dewan through the 2 Councillor

6/8/03

The Petitioner has no valid grievance - I agree to the order proposed

13/8/03

Draft Order 20/8

DM 10/8/03

Rd. 12-8-03.

13/8

12225 15.8.03

The order was accordingly issued. The petitioner has now again addressed a petition to Govt in which he says that he was retired while a period of six months was wanting to complete five years' service on pay of Rs 20/-, that in consequence his pension has been reduced, that if he had been allowed to remain in Service for that period, he would have become entitled to an enhanced pension and requests therefore that he may now be granted the enhanced pension to which he would have become entitled, had he been allowed to remain in Service for six months more.

The petitioner was ~~returned~~ retired so far back as November 1901. The question of his retirement cannot ~~now~~ at this distant date be reconsidered

x Flag D He has been recently informed that the pension sanctioned is what was admissible to him under the rules and that it cannot be enhanced. May the Petn be therefore filed!

Sd/- JB 30/8/03
JB
29/8/03

J.A.H. 1/9/03

Subsequent order on the petn

To Genl. A. Branch

Register and put up
references with note.

(Sd) H.R 3.7.03

References

3-7-03

160 15-7-03

3-7-03

Transmitted to the
Pension & Allowance
Department in con-
-tinuation.

3.7-03.

References put up.

6/7

Read

6/7.

V Serial

1903.04

No. 33

Name of Petitioner Kesavaiya late Revenue Gumasta

Village ~~(residing)~~ Bagepalli Taluk

Taluk Tirumakudlu (Jodi) Srinivaspur Etc.

District Kolar

Date of Arzi

Date of Receipt 3.7.03

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Nil

ABSTRACT

Adverting to the orders of Govt (No 2431-2 dated Genl A. 193 16.8.02 sanctioning in favour of the petr a pension of Rs 4.9.10 and a gratuity of Rs 42/-, Submits that he entered Service in 1867 (November and was retired on with effect from 18.11.1901; that at the commencement of his Service he drew

rely Rs 50 for 6 hrs was along
attending to Superior work
such as Shekdari, Judicial
gumastha &c in the commence-
ment, which is clearly
borne out by his Service
Register; that the pension
sanctioned to him is too low,
as the period of 14 years'
Service when he drew Rs 10/-
had been classed as inferior;
that as per Section 288 of
the civil Pension code the
Service of Rs 10/- should be
considered as Superior; that
the above order was to come
into force from June 1904
and should apply to the petr's
case as he was retired subsequently
(ie) on 18.11.1904; and that
he would get higher pension
if the 14 years' Service above
referred to were treated
as Superior Service qualifying for pension

(Pray for a higher pension
treating the said Service as
Superior — &c 31/10

33 R
3-7-1963

33.

Serial 2. VPHA-218

1903

Reference

dt

7-8-03

33 ಫೈಲ್ 03 ಕೆಳಗೆ ಕಂಡ ಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸಿದೆ
ಸಹಿ 3-7-03 ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯವರಿಗೆ

(illegible)
12-8-03

Transferred to the Pension & Allowance Branch in continuation.

Dwc - 13/8

dt
13-8-03.

Sub Powers with appre
Rote cash
DMB
29/8/03

No. 325

Name of Petitioner Kasavcah, Pensioner Shekdar

Village Jodi Thimasandra

Taluk Srinivaspur

District Kolar

Date of Arzi

Date of Receipt 3-8-03

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure

ABSTRACT

Requests that this application may be ordered to be filed with his former application regarding his pension, which has been referred to the pension branch and submits the following information regarding his services:—

(1) That petitioner was first entertained on 9/11/69 and retired on 18/11/901.

(2) That he was promoted from the post of Revenue Amanat on 15/1/ to this post of 20 Rs which was drawn by

[illegible] from [illegible] 1857 † 15/11/1901

(3) Mercy could [illegible] full 52 years on 1st May 1902, and the Petitioner and Respondent would have celebrated their Golden Wedding on the 6th of this month.

(4) Mercy [illegible] to the effect that a Law Assistant held office in the Service till the age of 60, if he so elected although his Superior Officer

(5) The [illegible] under the Queen was shown in the Statement of Accounts, (of course [illegible] fixed at £65) which was submitted to Court in 901 [illegible] was 59 years old, that the Petitioner [illegible]

(6) He [illegible] an allowance of £ [illegible] that the Court [illegible] of the Widow of the late Sir [illegible] a salary [illegible] that the Treasurer of the Australasian [illegible]

(7) [illegible] formerly [illegible] the Supreme [illegible] as the Petitioner [illegible]

(8) Court [illegible] Petitioner [illegible] less for [illegible] months while the [illegible] was petitioned although Queen Mary of Queen [illegible] the Petitioner would be Held [illegible]

(9) Although the Petitioner [illegible] some time

on the issue of less than 10% /
he was dissatisfied the Rules
being to the Supreme
Council.

(10) Remarked, with the
above circumstances, the
Council be justified
in refusing to grant
a Dispensation for
any Bro of the petitioner
to be raised
at the first Meeting
of the Lodge after
the Lodge had been
duly Consecrated
and that proper Provision be
therein made for the
Observance of the
other Rules.

WH
5/8/03

By post
3-8-03

125

No. P&A 29 03

Govt Gl & Rev. Secretariat

MYSORE ~~DEWAN'S OFFICE~~,

P & A BRANCH.

Dated Bangalore 2 IVt August 1903;

Endorsement granted to Kesavayya late Revenue gumasta of the Bagepalli Taluk residing in Timmasandra (Jodi) Srinivaspur Taluk

in reply to his Petition Registered No. 332 dated 3rd July 1903 praying for an enhancement of the pension sanctioned to him

---

Petitioner is informed that the pension sanctioned to him in G. Pro. No. 2431-2 P2A193 of 16/8/02 is what was admissible to him under the rules and that it cannot be enhanced

13/8/03

03832

16.VIII

By Order,

13/8/03

Secretary.

11/8/03

10/8/03